

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

Cecily R. McClellan
Creditor/objector

Chapter 9 Bankruptcy
Case #13-53846

Judge Steven W. Rhodes

V.

In re: City of Detroit, Michigan and
Emergency Manager Kevin Orr
Debtor/City of Detroit

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER REGARDING MOTION TO
PARTICIPATE IN THE CONFIRMATION HEARING (DKT 6896)

- I. Movant Cecily R McClellan, respondent in objection to the 5th Amendment of Plan and all Corrections by Creditors Who Filed Without an Attorney (Dkt. #6584), hereby submit this motion for reconsideration of this Court's opinion and order denying respondent request to be heard (Dkt.6867). This respondent motion (dkt.6867) related to Attorney Carol Neville of the Denton Law Firm failure to seek relief as it relates to Jones Day failure to provide adequate disclosure to Class 11 on the claw-back or recoupment. As state in the aforementioned motion (dkt.6867) and I quote "It is the contention of this objector that as a tax paying resident of the City of Detroit, former employee of the City of Detroit, retiree that the tax dollars used to pay the Denton Law Firm are provided by creditors like. Therefore, we are the clients that the Denton Law Firm represents and failure to represent constitutes ineffective representation by counsel.

FILED
2014 AUG 28 P 1:03
U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
E.D. MICHIGAN - DETROIT

The court appointed retiree committee attorneys' through the Denton Law Firm are required to legally pursue all reasonable option that would ameliorate the financial impact of bankruptcy on their clients. Which includes mandating all disclosures in plain language so that their clients can make an informed decision when voting?"

ARGUMENT

The respondent respectfully submits that Attorney's Carol Neville failure to seek relief on July 15, 2014, constitutes ineffective representation by counsel. This attorney stated in the presents of numerous witnesses that she elected to not seek relief in "essence" because she knew what the judge decision would be before it had been rendered. Further, Attorney Carol Neville stated that seeking relief could derail the bankruptcy. The issue of ineffective counsel has not been presented by any other objector in class 11.

CONCLUSION AND RELIEF

For the reasons stated, Respondent respectfully requests that this Court reconsider its order denying respondent motion (dkt.6867) to be heard.


Cecily R. McClellan
mccllellanr@netzero.net

August 28, 2014